REMARKS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on February 02, 2004, made final. Claims 1-10 are standing for examination. The Examiner rejects claims 1 -10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunnicut (US 5,889,952) hereinafter Hunnicut, in view of Epstein (US 2002/0124176 A1) hereinafter Epstein.

The applicant has carefully noted and reviewed the Examiner's rejection, reference and comments. Applicant herein amends the claims t more particularly point out the subject matter deemed patentable by the applicant. Applicant argues the patentability of the claims, as amended, over the prior art provided by the Examiner.

The last argument presented by applicant in the previous response argued that the tokens generated by Hunnicut are stored at the server to match with user-provided log-on in order to allow access to requested files that have been previously/recently accessed by that user. In the art of Hunnicut the user always has to "log-on" with at least a user name.

The Examiner responds to the above argument stating that Epstein discloses that identification is provided by a token without having to enter a user name or password. The Examiner continues to state it would have been obvious to combine Epstein with Hunnicut to alleviate the necessity of the user providing this identification via a separate process.

Applicant responds by amending claim 1 to broaden the user name and password to "user information". Applicant points out in the art of Epstein the user must provide biometric information in the form of a thumb print etc.. This teaches away from applicant's claim 1, as amended, and the basic foundation of applicant's invention wherein personal information is not required to login with a portable device. Further, applicant points out that in the art of Epstein, the key "V" which is stored in the Token device is input into the Token device when the device is issued

to the user. There is absolutely no facility disclosed in Epstein to <u>generate and store</u> the Token at the PD as claimed. Specifically, the Token in Epstein deletes all information received from the security system (Fig. 4, 580).

Further, applicant argued that there is no teaching in Hunnicut of sending the P-token, once generated, back to the PD for storage. The Examiner responds to this teaching stating that Hunnicut teaches that the user token is stored on the RAM of the Web server or other suitable storage device (applicant asserts that this storage device is still at the network level). The Examiner states that Epstein discloses that the token is stored at the token device. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined art fails to teach a P-Token generated and stored at the user's PD device. As argued above the V key of Epstein is the only constant user "token" always stored at the Token device and is issued at OEM level when the user receives the device. Epstein does not teach or suggest that the V key may be downloadable from a remote server on the WWW. Hunnicut also fails to disclose generating a P-token at the server and storing it at the PD.

Applicant argues that in order for the Examiner to prove a valid prima facie rejection the art must teach all of the claimed limitations, or the suggestion to accomplish applicant's invention must come from the reference and <u>not</u> from applicant's disclosure. Clearly, the only motivation to generate and store the P-token at the user's PD is only derived from applicant's specification as the P-token <u>must</u> come from the user's requesting device (PD) in order for the log-in to not be required. There is no teaching in Hunnicut or Epstein of sending the P-token, once generated, back to the PD for storage. The art actually teaches away from applicant's limitations as recited in the independent claims.

Applicant believes the art of Hunnicut and Epstein clearly fail to teach applicant's claim limitations, as amended. Applicant believes claims 1 and 6 are clearly patentable over the art of Hunnicut. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended upon a patentable claim.

In view of the above arguments, and remarks, it is clear that the reference of Hunnicut fails to anticipate or suggest applicant's independent claims. It is

therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Neil Daswani et al.

by_____

Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457